

REMARKS

Claims 1-26, 28-33 and 35-36 are pending herein.

By this Amendment, claim 20 is amended to more fully distinguish the invention of claim 20 from that of the art cited against claim 20.

No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claim 20 is found at, for example, the last paragraph of page 17, and at page 21, lines 3-5 of the specification.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nasri at the interview held July 7, 2004, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

I. Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings because the drawings allegedly do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action states that the recess formed in the interconnecting line according to claim 23 and the resin having light transmitting properties according to each of claims 18 and 29 must be shown in the drawings or the features cancelled from the claims.

Applicant submits that the drawings show the features alleged to be absent by the Patent Office. Specifically, the recess formed in the interconnecting line according to claim 23 is illustrated in Figure 25, as described in the specification at page 31, line 26 to page 32, line 1. Figure 25 clearly shows a recess 346 formed in the molding material 40 exposing the interconnecting lines 20 and 22. With respect to the allegation that a resin having light transmitting properties according to claims 18 and 29 is not shown in the drawings, Applicant

respectfully submits that this feature is clearly shown in Figure 10. Here, the resin 66 is transparent resin. See page 25, line 23 of the specification.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the drawings show the claimed features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

A. Yoshida

Claims 20, 21, 23, 25, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,632,027 (hereinafter "Yoshida"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action references Figure 1 of Yoshida and alleges that Yoshida discloses a resin molded component 150 formed of resin, and an interconnecting line 147 in the molded component, at least part of the interconnecting line being exposed.

Claim 20 recites a platform comprising a molded component formed of resin wherein the molded component has a through hole formed therein for inserting an optical fiber in the molded component. The platform further comprises an interconnecting line in the molded component. The interconnecting line has first surfaces covered with the molded component and at least one second surface exposed from the molded component, wherein the at least one second surface is surrounded by a surface of the molded component so as to come together in a substantially planar surface.

Contrary to the assertions made by the Patent Office, Yoshida does not disclose the features of claim 20.

Instead, Figure 1 of Yoshida shows the interconnecting line 147 outside of the resin molded component 150. Further, as described in the specification and as shown in Figure 1 of Yoshida, the lead frame 150 (a molded component as defined by the Patent Office) is connected to the terminal for ground, and for example, bonding wire 147 (interconnecting

line 147 as defined by the Patent Office) is led from the optical assembly and connected to another lead terminal. See column 3, lines 28-30 of Yoshida. This is not a disclosure of an interconnecting line in the molded component wherein the interconnecting line has first surfaces covered with the molded component and at least one second surface exposed from the molded component and further wherein the at least one second surface is surrounded by a surface of the molded component so as to come together in a substantially planar surface.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Yoshida fails to anticipate claim 20 and the claims dependent therefrom. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

B. Iwase

Claims 20-26, 28 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,270,236 (hereinafter "Iwase"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office references Figure 6 of Iwase and alleges that Iwase discloses a resin molded component formed of resin and an interconnecting line (2) in the molded component, at least part of the interconnecting line being exposed.

Nowhere does Iwase disclose these features. In fact, reference number 2 of Iwase is merely a substrate, not an interconnect line. See page 4, line 16-17 of Iwase. Further, contrary to the assertion made by the Patent Office, Figure 6 and the other figures of Iwase illustrate a substrate 2, an insulating layer 2a, a mounting surface 2b, and the grooves 2c and not a resin and an interconnecting line in the molded component where at least part of the interconnecting line being exposed. Applicant submits that the reference numerals described in the specification of Iwase define the substrate shown in Figure 6. Accordingly, Iwase fails to disclose an interconnecting line in the molded component, as recited in claim 20 of the

present application. Moreover, the Patent Office has failed to show whether Iwase even discloses an interconnect line.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Iwase fails to anticipate claim 20 and any of the claims dependent therefrom. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Yoshida in view of Torazawa

Claims 30-33 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,689 (hereinafter "Torazawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of claims 30-33 and 36 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20.

The Office Action acknowledges that Yoshida fails to disclose a plurality of platforms and fails to disclose a light transmitting resin. However, the Patent Office alleges that Torazawa cures these deficiencies.

Even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have found Torazawa to teach these limitations, the presently claimed invention still would not have been achieved. Specifically, nothing in Torazawa remedies the deficiencies of Yoshida discussed above with respect to claim 20. That is, nothing in the combined teachings of Torazawa and Yoshida would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to an interconnecting line in the molded component wherein the interconnecting line has first surfaces covered with the molded component and at least one second surface exposed from the molded component and further wherein the at least one second surface is surrounded by a surface of the molded component so as to come together in a substantially planar surface, as recited in claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Torazawa and Yoshida, whether taken alone or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the

invention of claim 20 or any of dependent claims 30-33 and 36. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

B. Yoshida or Iwase in view of Torazawa

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshida or Iwase in view of Torazawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action acknowledges that Yoshida and Iwase each fail to disclose a light transmitting resin. The Office Action alleges that Torazawa discloses a light transmitting resin and that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the light transmitting resin of Torazawa with either Yoshida or Iwase in order to eliminate loss of light. However, even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have found Torazawa to teach a light transmitting resin, the presently claimed invention still would not have been achieved. Specifically, nothing in Torazawa remedies the deficiencies of Yoshida, as discussed above, or remedies the deficiencies of Iwase. That is, nothing in the combined teachings of Torazawa and Yoshida, or Torazawa and Iwase, would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to an interconnecting line in the molded component wherein the interconnecting line has first surfaces covered with the molded component and at least one second surface exposed from the molded component and further wherein the at least one second surface is surrounded by a surface of the molded component so as to come together in a substantially planar surface, as recited in claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Torazawa, Yoshida and/or Iwase, whether taken alone or in any combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claim 20 or of depending claim 29. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-19 are allowed.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-26, 28-33, 35 and 36 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/hs

Date: July 8, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--